

Question	Response
1) Item xiii: Page Limitations. Can the page limitations for Technical, Management and Past Performance (total of twelve pages), be manipulated/traded, as long as the twelve-page limitation is maintained? Example: Can Technical be (5) pages, Management be (4) pages and Past Performance be (3) pages?	Page Limitations will not be changed; However, we note that the page limitation noted in the CBD for the technical portion of the solicitations shows 2 (two) pages. This is a clerical error. The limitation should have read 20 (twenty) pages. Please plan on a maximum of 20 pages for the technical portion of your proposal. We will be issuing an amendment to the CBD to this effect within the next few days
2) Item xvi: Is the closing date for receipt of offers (1600 EDT on the 21st day) August 23, 1999.	Yes, 1600, 23 Aug 99
3) Request that an extension for the receipt of offers from the 21 st day to the 30 th day be provided. Please provide your concurrence or comments.	Disapproved. This request was insufficient in any detail or basis of why the government should extend the date of receipt of offers past 21 days.
4) In addition could you please provide the following documents a) TBMCS Security Classification Guide (draft) (UNCLASSIFIED) b) ABI Software Users Manual (UNCLASSIFIED)	As per the HHERB site direction. We are providing the SUM in Electronic form on request and The SCG will be faxed to your location
5) The Government states the environmental tests will be witnessed by the Government using a "Combined Test Force concept". What is the definition of "Combined Test Force concept" and what is the composition of the "Combined Test Force"?	For a definition of "Combined Test Force " Please refer to the SAMP (reference exhibit at the ABI HERBB location on line for definition). Composition (membership) is defined by the Program Office, and can be comprised of a contractor/gov't team. . Witnessing Environmental Testing Defined: Compliance is a contractor responsibility as the product is commercial. It is not the intent of the Gov't to run the environmental tests, but to avoid duplication of testing by witnessing/participating as a informal witness of the contractors environmental testing to obtain a confidence in the performance of the Commercial Equipment. In this manner when the contractor presents the records of testing to the government as evidence of conformance to their standards, the government can accept the record with little or no issue
6) The CBD announcement states "The ABI system will be fielded in quantities of three, two on aircraft and the third as the on-site spare". This intent does not correspond to the delivery of only sixteen (16) ABI Systems when the Government has identified six sites for site survey and training.	In reading the CBD the Gov't indicates from 1 to 6 training and survey sites. Training and site surveys are independent of the ABI systems and their delivery points. The Gov't may choose to deliver a 4-system configuration to any one of those sites dependent on the squadron's size.
7) Further, the requirement to deliver at least four units per month does not correspond to the intent to deploy systems in-groups of three. (a) Is the Government planning to field systems to only five sites (3x5)? (b) Is the first article, having undergone environmental testing, expected to be delivered as one of the first set of four units? (c) Since there	Completion of the contractual delivery requirements are independent of training, and site surveys (a) response: yes up to 5 sites (b) response: current planning does not intend to deliver the test article to the field as part of the first site delivery of 3 systems

are insufficient units to be deployed to all sites, how should the contractor plan for system delivery and estimate shipping costs for equipment?	© response : Training and site surveys are independent of deliveries, see (a) for number of sites Each unit should include shipping costs as instructed in the CBD
8) The ABI Data Package CDRL identifies "Safety, EMI, security, warranties, and crypto endorsements to be included". Specifically, what documents are required? Who is the cognizant authority for endorsement?	- Since this is ruggedized commercial equipment procurement, it is expected the contractor will produce tests results, certifications, or warranties that indicate compliance with their equipment's performance requirements. As such the contractor is the cognizant authority, with the exception of crypto, in which case the contractor will already have established the necessary relationships and received the certificates from NSA
9) Under Acceptance Test, the CBD announcement states "The initial production system shall be submitted to a comprehensive qualification test by the Government to ensure the functionality of all system aspects (ref: STD)". The ABI STD does not address all system aspects of the deliverable ABI Systems. Is it the Government's expectation that the Contractor will augment the procedures of the existing STD in the development of the ABI Qualification Test Procedures?	- No. Since the STD represents the performance of the ABI software on equipment it is the intent of the Gov't to run through the STD (modified) as necessary to validate that the contractors hardware performs in a manner that demonstrates the full functionality of the software. The government will work with the contractor in those areas where the unique aspects of their hardware are not reflected in the STD to ensure the full performance of the software can be exercised using the contractor hardware. If the contractor feels that the STD does not address all aspects of the deliverable ABI System, the contractor may augment the procedures to demonstrate their compliance with the scope of the RFP.
10) Assuming the answer to question 4 is "yes", there appears to be a difference in the Government's "reference" to documents. In accordance with answer 4, the reference to the STD is construed to mean the STD is to be used as a source document for information rather than as an additional requirements document. (a) How does this correspond to the references to MIL-STDs under the environmental section of the CBD announcement? (b) Are the MIL-STDs intended to be requirements or to be used as "design to" guidelines? (c) What is the Government's intended definition of "ref"?	- The STD is to be used as a source document for information by the contractor. - (a) & (b) & (c) response: The use of (MIL STD refs) are to provide a pointer to equivalent Military standards methods the contractor may chose to reference for their information and use. However, since this is a commercial hardware procurement the contractors equipment must meet the performance outlined in the RFP.
11) Will the Government execute the Qualification Test at some to be determined facility, or will the contractor execute the Qualification Test in-plant with the Government in attendance? If the Government will execute the test, where will the test be executed? Is contractor participation required during the Qualification Test?	The government will provide a facility (ABI Software Integration Facility) for Qualification testing. The contractor will demonstrate compliance. The government & contractor will participate together in running the STD (modified) as this is a demonstration of their compliance with the terms of the contract.
12) The Government announcement stipulates that ABI Systems be outfitted with 1GB of main memory. The number of vendors that offer SUN components that meet ABI requirements is very limited and those vendors that are able to offer 1GB configurations (at least in conjunction with a Creator Graphics board) do so at a significantly higher cost. Since the 1GB memory requirement is not necessary to effectively execute the ABI software baseline today, would the Government consider postponing the 1GB requirement until memory expansion options are more affordable?	As is pointed out the minimum memory required to operate the ABI software today is 500 Meg. The government's intent is to procure COTS equipment at a low risk and reasonable cost and as such is not intent on development of hardware. Therefore, The government's requirement is clarified to reflect the minimum of 500 Meg main memory with a desire of 1000 MB. The CBD and the Evaluation Standards will be amended to this effect. The proposal will be evaluated based on compliance with the minimum requirement of 500 Meg.
13) The ABI DD-254 stipulates TEMPEST requirements for the ABI equipment. Further review indicates the DD-254 is based on a template that is several years old and does not incorporate full implementation of the NISPOM and its COMSEC supplement. Is it the Government's intent to require all ABI Systems to be certified to meet TEMPEST	No. The DD254 applies only to the contractor and contractors facility. Any and all requirements for the ABI system equipment are detailed in the RFP as published in the CBD.

requirements?	
14) We request a copy of the Security Classification Guide for ABI.	As soon as a Fax number and individuals name is provided we will fax the SCG
15) The Government's pricing template posted at the website identifies quantity prices for 1-3 units and 4-16 units. Can the offerer propose intermediate quantity prices other than those in the template?	Yes
16) Will the Gov't consider a proposal for part of the ABI requirements in the CBD	No. All offeror's shall address the complete scope outlined in the CBD notice in their proposal. However, offerors are encouraged to team/subcontract as appropriate
17) The Government updated the Evaluation Criteria Checklist on the HHERB webpage and also added a list of changes to the CBD Announcement. The changes in the CBD Announcement addressed the amount of memory required in the ABI System and the correction to the number of pages allowed for the Technical Proposal. There was only a single highlighted change in the Evaluation Criteria Checklist and that change related to the memory requirement. However, the Evaluation Criteria Checklist included two new requirements, one relating to TDIMF Rev D or later for TIBS, TDDS, and TADIXS-B formats and the other relating to TADIL-A and SIDS native format. These changes are not highlighted as changes in the Checklist nor are they included in the list of CBD changes. Is it the Government's intent to add these new requirements at this time?	The Gov't update of the Evaluation criteria is in error as you have pointed out. The 1st reference in your question is wrong and will be corrected. The government is not creating any other evaluations other than those cited in the CBD announcement. Your second reference is not an error as it is reflected in the original version. However, after close review of the original evaluation criteria a number of spelling mistakes are noted as well as omissions from the text of the CBD. Therefore the evaluation criteria have been updated as a final version to reflect your points as well as to accurately reflect the CBD requirements. The government's intent is not to require or evaluate any more or less compliance than is outlined in the CBD announcement.
18) Is FAR Clause 52.219-23, as listed under 52.212-5(b), Contract Terms and Conditions, applicable to this solicitation?	No, this clause is not applicable to this solicitation. After further review we noticed that there were a total of 4 clauses referenced under FAR 52.212-5(b) that are not applicable and should be noted so on the CBD Notice. Therefore the following change is being made to CBD subparagraph xii (b) to ensure their exclusion from this effort: Xii (b) add 52.219.3, 52.219-4, 52.219.5, and 52.219.23
<p>19) 1-The original RFP stated that "this acquisition has not been set-aside for small businesses". However, the latest update to the solicitation, dated 8/17/99, adds FAR 52.219-3, Notice of total HUBZone set-aside and other related clauses. Is this correct? Is the acquisition now truly set aside for HUBZone small business concerns only? Please confirm this ASAP.</p> <p>2-The RFP updates of 8/10/99 and 8/17/99 both reference Item 17, which appears to be missing in the original RFP. Please clarify. Thank you.</p>	<p>The purpose of CBD last amendment was to note additional FAR Clauses, 52.219-3, 52.219-4, 52.219-5 and 52.219-23 that are not applicable to this solicitation under subparagraph (xii)(b). Please see CBD subparagraph (xii) which now reads: "(xii) FAR Clause 52.212-5, Contract Terms and Conditions Required to Implement Statutes or Executive Orders-Commercial Items, is applicable to this acquisition and all referenced clauses are applicable except for the following clauses under paragraph (b): 52.219-3, 52.219-4, 52.219-5, 52.219-14, 52.219-23, 52.225-18, 52-225-19, 52-225-21 and 52.239-1 and all clauses listed under paragraph (c)."</p> <p>Also, please note that this amendment information is also discussed on the HERBB under ABI questions.</p> <p>2. Item 17. is the whole CBD descriptive wording.</p>
20) Can we submit three volumes containing all the	Having your pricing information under separate cover is

<p>sections required by the solicitation, with the exception of pricing, which will be provided under separate cover. Can you confirm via e-mail that this will be acceptable and fully compliant? Or if there is any change regarding this</p>	<p>fine as long as your 3 volumes contain, Technical, Management, Past Performance and Contractual Information as detailed in the CBD announcement.</p>
---	---